

REMARKS

In the December 1, 2010 Office Action, claims 17-24 and 26-28 stand rejected in view of prior art. On the other hand, claim 25 was indicated as containing allowable subject matter. Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for this indication of allowable subject matter and the thorough examination of this application. Claims 17-28 also were rejected as failing to comply with the written description requirement. No other objections or rejections were made in the Office Action.

Status of Claims and Amendments

In response to the December 1, 2010 Office Action, Applicant has cancelled claims 17-24 and amended claims 25 and 26 as indicated above. Thus, claims 25-28 are now pending, with claim 25 being the only independent claim. Reexamination and reconsideration of the pending claims are respectfully requested in view of above amendments and the following comments.

Applicant has cancelled/amended the claims to accept the indicated allowable subject matter. Specifically, claim 25, which was indicated as containing allowable subject matter, has been rewritten in independent form without the limitation that was allegedly not in compliance with the written description requirement. Claim 26 has been amended to depend from claim 25. Claims 27-28 depend from claim 26, which now depends from claim 25.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §112

In paragraph 2 of the Office Action, claims 17-28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Specifically, the Office Action indicates that the limitation “the first neutral wire, the first tooth winding portion, the first lead-out wire, the crossover wire, the power wire, the second tooth winding portion, the second lead-out wire, and the second neutral wire defining a seamless, continuous line” was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Appl. No. 10/577,067
Amendment dated February 15, 2011
Reply to Office Action of December 1, 2010

In response, Applicant has cancelled claims 17-24 and amended claims 25 and 26 as mentioned above. Specifically, claim 25, which was indicated as containing allowable subject matter, has been rewritten in independent form without the above limitation. The Office Action indicates on pages 2-3 (paragraph 1) that the above limitation is taught by the prior art applied in the Office Action. Additionally, the Office Action does not mention the above limitation in the statement of reasons for allowance on pages 9-10 (paragraph 6) of the Office Action. Thus removing this limitation does not raise a new issue. Claim 26 has been amended to depend from claim 25. Claims 27-28 depend from claim 26, which now depends from claim 25. In view of the foregoing amendments and comments, Applicant believes that the claims now comply with 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

In paragraph 5 of the Office Action, claims 17-24 and 26-28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Japanese Patent Publication No. 2003-134716 (Miyawaki et al.) in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0043886 (Fujita et al.). In response, Applicant has cancelled claims 17-24 and amended claims 25 and 26 as mentioned above. Since claims 17-24 have been cancelled, this rejection of these claims is now moot. Since claims 26-28 now depend from independent claim 25, which was indicated as containing allowable subject matter, this rejection of these claims is also now moot. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested in view of the above comments and amendments.

Allowable Subject Matter

In paragraph 6 of the Office Action, claim 25 was indicated as containing allowable subject matter. Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for this indication of allowable subject matter and the thorough examination of this application. In response, claim 25 has been rewritten in independent form without the limitation that was allegedly not in compliance with the written description requirement, as explained above. Also, in response, claim 26 has been amended to depend from claim 25. Claims 27-28 depend from claim 26, which now depends from claim 25. Thus, independent claim 25 as well as dependent claims

Appl. No. 10/577,067
Amendment dated February 15, 2011
Reply to Office Action of December 1, 2010

26-28 are now believed to be allowable. Accordingly, allowance of these claims and this application is respectfully requested.

* * *

In view of the foregoing amendment and comments, Applicant respectfully asserts that claims 25-28 are now in condition for allowance. Reexamination and reconsideration of the pending claims are respectfully requested. If there are any questions regarding this Amendment, please feel free to contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

/Patrick A. Hilsmier/
Patrick A. Hilsmier
Reg. No. 46,034

GLOBAL IP COUNSELORS, LLP
1233 Twentieth Street, NW, Suite 700
Washington, DC 20036
(202)-293-0444
Dated: February 15, 2011

S:\02-FEB11-YTY\DK-US065040 Amendment (Applicants singular).doc